

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, and 21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, and 21 stand rejected.

Applicants request further review and examination in view of the claimed amendments.

Telephonic Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the examiner for the telephonic interview of August 19, 2008. Agreement between the parties was reached that applicants would amend the independent claims to clarify the techniques used. Those amendments are contained in this reply. If the examiner would like to discuss anything further, applicants' representative may be reached at (206) 903-2467.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatenable over Leach et al. (Pat. No. 6,412,020; "Leach") in view of Dardinski et al. (Pat. No. 6,754,885; "Dardinski").

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15 to disclose that the project is a software development project. This is supported in the specification in at least paragraph [0009].

Claim 1 recites the limitation,

providing at least one flavor object comprising data for modifying said project system for a specific purpose, wherein the at least one flavor object includes flavor-specific project configuration properties *comprising at least one of a caption of a project node, an icon of a project node, a property allowing a project browse object to be completely overridden, a control allowing a project to be renamed, a sort priority control, a property allowing a command to be added, a property allowing a command to be removed, a property allowing a command to be disabled, a filter, a property allowing a default generator given a file extension to be determined, or a property allowing a human-readable generator name to be mapped to a COM object;*

(emphasis added).

The examiner states that this is taught by Dardinski at Col. 12, Lines 7-17:

An instance of Parameterized Object may be associated with zero or more other Parameterized Objects that are referred to as Modifier Parameterized Objects. The Parameter Values in the Modifier Parameterized Objects are used to override the parameters of the Parameterized Object. An instance of a Parameterized Object can have zero or more of these modifiers to modify their parameters. If an object has more than one modifier, the modifications are made in the order that the modifier objects were applied, with the resulting overrides representing the accumulative effect of having applied all the modifications;

at Col. 14, Lines 15-37 (reprinting omitted for reasons of space); at Col. 39, Line 19 through Col. 40, Line 56 (reprinting omitted for reasons of space); at Col. 64, Lines 21-24:

When user-level security is enabled, the security functions provide authentication by presenting a log-in dialog requesting a user name and password when a user starts any IDA application;

at Col. 22, Lines 2-5:

Some of the attribute and assignable selections may be disabled when the object type is displayed, depending upon the settings of the object type's containing category;

and at Col. 3, Lines 19-27:

Appearance objects provide (or reference) icons or representations indicating how the configurable objects are to be depicted, e.g., in a configuration editor. Placeholder objects are created for each configurable object that is placed in a configuration using that editor. The placeholder objects identify the sizes, locations, colors, etc., of the icons used in the editor to represent the configurable objects.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited reference fails to disclose where a project configuration property comprises a caption of a project node, an icon of a project node, a control allowing a project to be renamed, a property allowing a command to be disabled, a filter, a property allowing a default generator given a file extension to be determined, or a property allowing a human-readable generator name to be mapped to a COM object. As

such, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance because the cited references do not teach every element of the claim.

Claims 2-5 and 7 depend from claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-5 and 7 are in condition for allowance because claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 8 recites the limitation,

a process configured to instantiate a base project object comprising data for creating a project system, *wherein the base project object implements a base project configuration object that includes configuration properties for the base project object, the configuration properties comprising at least one of an indication of a build of the project system, an output file to be created, or an indication as to where the output file will be placed;*

(emphasis added).

The examiner states that the emphasized portion of this limitation is taught by Dardinski at Col. 40, Lines 14-16:

Examples of objects that would be properties of the Application object are the palette window, the project manager window, output window and the editor manager;

Col. 51, Lines 19-20:

Print settings for a Report can be edited by selecting the Report, then selecting "File.vertline.Print Setup" from the application menu.

and Col. 94, Lines 9-12:

This action opens an output window for status and error messages associated with the compile, similar to the functionality of the Microsoft Visual C++ compiler.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The references do not teach "wherein the configuration properties [comprise] ... an indication of a build of the project system. Paragraph [0055] of the specification states, "Project configuration objects add various configuration properties specific to one kind of *build for one platform*," (emphasis added). As used in the specification, a build refers to a platform-specific compilation of the project. For instance, a different build would be necessary for UNIX and for Microsoft Windows. The references do not appear to disclose techniques relating to the platform for which the project is intended.

The references further do not teach “wherein the configuration properties [comprise] ... an output file to be created.” Printing a report, as disclosed in the reference, produces a physical print out of the report on paper. In contrast, the output file to be created in the present application is an electronic copy that is stored on a computer readable medium, such as a computer’s hard disk.

The references further do not teach wherein the configuration properties [comprise] ... an indication as to where the output file will be placed.” Because, as discussed above, the references do not teach the output file to be created, they likewise do not teach an indication as to where the output file will be placed.

As such, applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is in condition for allowance because the cited references do not teach every element of the claim. Claims 9-12 and 14 depend from claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-12 and 14 are in condition for allowance because claim 8 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 stands rejected for reasons similar to claim 8. For reasons similar to why claim 8 is in condition for allowance, applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is in condition for allowance. Claims 16-19 and 21 depend from claim 15. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16-19 and 21 are in condition for allowance because claim 15 is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants request the Examiner reconsider the rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance of all the claims.

Date: September 30, 2008

/Peter Trahms-Neudorfer/
Peter Trahms-Neudorfer
Registration No. 59,282

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439